

Anna Marie Young

From: Penny Harding [Penny.Harding@resources.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 16, 2009 7:35 AM
To: Anna Marie Young
Subject: FW: Urban Greening Planning Grants

From: Steven Goetz [mailto:sgoet@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2009 12:42 PM
To: UrbanGreening
Subject: Urban Greening Planning Grants

Comments below are associated with the page numbers used in the draft guidelines.

Page 4: Ineligible projects include “plans that do not refer to an existing planting palette, or do not create one, where none exists.” This example should be clarified so that a grant proposal that proposes to vary from an existing planting palette would remain eligible if sufficient justification is provided. Such an instance could occur if an existing planting palette is found to contain undesirable plants (e.g. poor growing habits, disease vulnerability, or invasive/noxious characteristics) that were not known at the time the palette was initially adopted. A proposal that varies from an existing planting palette for such reasons should be eligible to receive funding. In fact, all grant proposals that refer to an existing plant palette should include a task to evaluate the planting palette to make sure it is appropriate for the proposed use.

Page 5: The description of “custodial agencies” is not very clear. Please provide examples and a definition of the term in Appendix J.

Page 17: Is there a spelling error in the form referring to Existing Planning Documents? Should the question be “Does the jurisdiction have an adopted Plant Palette?”

Page 21: The definition of planting palette only refers to consideration of environmental factors. Consideration should also include plant characteristics such as growth habits, biomass, disease vulnerability and invasiveness. Can the definition be more comprehensive to address these concerns?

Steve Goetz, Vice President
California Native Plant Society
Willis Linn Jepson Chapter